

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

10/072,069

Examiner

Ashok B. Patel

Applicant(s)

MCDANIEL, DAVID W.

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 11/28/2005.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-27.
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
- (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
- 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☒ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date 03/09/2006
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material
5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____
7. ☒ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other _____


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are allowed.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

2. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Kurt M. Pankratz on 04/13/2006.

3. The application has been amended as follows:

In the claims:

- a. Claim 20 (currently amended) Logic for securing packet-based communications, the logic encoded in a medium and ~~operable when~~ executed to:

receive at a first translation module a stream comprising a plurality of packets regarding a communication from a first user interface device intended for a second user interface device, each packet having an original destination address and an original source address; and

for each of the packets, perform an address modification process including changing the original destination address to a selected one of a plurality of modified destination addresses assigned to a second translation module remote from the first translation module, wherein each of the selected modified destination addresses is resolvable by the second translation module to the original destination address, wherein

Art Unit: 2154

the address modification process is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device.

REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Applicant's arguments presented in Appeal Brief filed on 01/30/2006 are persuasive for the following reasons:

The prior art of the record, Sheymov does not disclose "wherein the address modification process is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device." For each packet in a received stream of packets, the address modification process includes "changing the original destination address [in each received packet] to a selected one of a plurality of modified destination addresses." (Seymov's Cyber address book 20 fails to change the original destination address to a modified destination address for each of the packets, as required by the claims. Accordingly, the cyber address book 20 fails to perform an address modification process as required by the claims.)

The prior art of the record, Sheymov does not disclose "receiving at a first translation module a stream comprising a plurality of packets, where each packet has an original destination address." (Sheymov's alphabetic destination address is substituted with the current numerical cyber address and the latter is included in packets. Sheymov fails to disclose that the alphabetic destination address is ever part of a packet. Rather, Sheymov's cyber address is the only address used in a packet.)

The prior art of the record, Sheymov does not disclose "the modified destination addresses are resolvable by the second translation module to the original destination address. (Sheymov, pg. 7, 11. 25-28. However, checking for a correct address does not disclose that each of the selected modified destination addresses is resolvable by the second translation module to the original destination address for forwarding the packet to the second user interface device.")

The prior art of the record, Munger does not disclose "negotiating translation parameters with a remote device for a communication stream between a first user interface device and a second user interface device, the translation parameters comprising an original destination address, a plurality of available destination addresses, and an algorithm;" and "changing the packet to have the original destination address, wherein the address change is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device." (Munger teaches that a router uses the same "IP hopping" to transmit a packet to the final destination. (Id. at ¶ 0111). Thus, the destination address would be determined by the hopblock algorithm and would not be the "original destination address" that was a part of the negotiated translation parameters. (see Id. at ¶ 0109.) , "In Munger, to establish a secure session with a router, a client computer sends a request that includes the client's current IP address and a known IP address for the router. (Munger, ¶ 0112). The router responds by sending "the transmit and receive hopblocks that the client 801 will use when communicating with the TARP router." (Id. at ! 0112)", and "While Munger may discuss

Art Unit: 2154

the transmission of addresses, Munger's transmitted addresses cannot be characterized as "negotiating translation parameters . . .")

None of the prior arts of record teach or fairly suggest the claimed limitations.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER